

ON THE *BĀLA-KĀṆḌA* OF THE *RĀMĀYAṆA*

THE AUTHENTIC PARTS

BY

J. VEKERDI

The works of A. Holtzmann and H. Jacobi made it clear that both the first and the last books of the *Rāmāyaṇa* — the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* and the *Uttara-kāṇḍa* — are later additions to the original Vālmīkian bulk of the poem (books II—VI).¹ Regarding their relation to the original parts, however, there are differences between the two additional books. Book VII is, in its entirety, a quite superfluous supplement affixed to the poem, the story being completely closed by the last lines of the preceding Book VI. Book I is, on the contrary, very closely connected with the following original parts of the epic: the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* begins in this spurious book, not in the authentic Book II. The *Ayōdhyā-kāṇḍa* (Book II) starts already *in medias res*; and, beyond this, cantos II, 1 sqq. appear clearly to be the continuation of some other foregoing stories (cf. the first lines of II, 1 and some allusions in the later cantos of Book II made to certain previous events which are supposed to be known from some preceding parts, as, e.g., Bharata's visit to Yudhājit in II, 8, 28).

Apart from all this, a beginning *in medias res* is very unlikely in Sanskrit epic poetry. On this point, of course, laws of Sanskrit epic composition cannot be deduced from the two great epics, the first part of the *Mahābhārata* being also a late addition to the poem. Indirect testimonies, however, throw some light on the practice of ancient Sanskrit epic overture: the later *kāvya* poems and — a more convincing argument — the short epic stories incorporated in the great epics as, e.g., the *Sāvitrīyōpākhyāna*, *Nalōpākhyāna*, *Sagara-kathā* etc. These *epyllia* — even in a very late elaboration as the *Sagara-kathā* — seem to have conserved compositional and stylistic traditions of the oldest Indian epic poetry prior to the establishment of the present text of the great epics. The *Mahābhārata*, in its presumably oldest form (the "*Ur-Mahābhārata*"), was, in all probability, similar to these short epics. Each of them begins with the genealogy of the heroes or with an account of events previous to the main story.² Thus, as both the earlier and the later epic practice speaks for an

¹ Cf. *Acta Orient. Hung.* XVII (1964), p. 187, with further literature.

² The *vaṃśānucarita* sections of *kāvya* poems and *purāṇa* literature are, perhaps, enlargements of this ancient epic introduction.

introductory part in each epic poem, the presence of such an introduction before Book II of the *Rāmāyaṇa* must be supposed in the original text of the poem, too.

Jacobi, supporting a similar view, selected a dozen of stanzas from Book I as representing the presumed original beginning of the poem.³ The hypothesis of the excellent Indologist is highly probable. In full accordance with him, the original beginning is to be sought in I, 5, 1 sqq.⁴ The preceding cantos have nothing to do with the poem: 1. and 3. are summaries of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, 2. and 4. contain an introductory legend about the author and his work. Moreover, the first four cantos themselves betray a quite heterogeneous origin: I, 2 (the legend on the origin of the *ślōka* stanza) was secondarily interpolated between 1 and 3 as it turns out from the fact that the first lines of 3 continue the end of 1, without respect of canto 2. The two summaries themselves (I, 1 and 3) are quite different works: I, 1 differs chronologically from I, 3 the latter taking into account also the apocryphic parts of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa*, the former ignoring them; it means, I, 1 is older than I, 3.⁵

The thesis that the original text began with I, 5, 1 sqq. was based by Jacobi on arguments borrowed from the contents: the place of the action and the first hero (i.e. the city Ayōdhyā and king Daśaratha) are introduced in this sarga. Jacobi's selection gives a fairly readable text and certainly each of the enumerated *ślōkas* belonged to the original poem, but as a whole, the wording of the introduction arrived at by him greatly differs stylistically from the Vālmīkian epic: it would be more in the manner of the short epics (episodes) of the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*. The style proves that not only the stanzas referred to but some longer passages of the present text are genuine.

I, 5 shows a sudden break of style. In the foregoing cantos partly the pious tone of the *purāṇas* and religious *Mahābhārata* episodes prevails, partly a dry enumeration bereft from poetical ornaments. In canto 5 the text abruptly changes over into the *par excellence* Vālmīkian epic style characteristic of the authentic parts of the poem: description of town and king with abundant use of descriptive embellishments. The first two stanzas, unjustifiable as they may seem at this place, are organic parts of the epic introduction. They contain a praise of the Ikṣvāku race (a descendant of whom is Rāma) to whom once the earth belonged, and an offspring of whom was the famous Sagara. The mention of Sagara, playing no part in the authentic parts of the poem, is no allusion to the spurious Sagara episode of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa*. Reference to the

³ *Das Rāmāyaṇa* (1893), p. 57. The *ślōkas* from book I pointed out by Jacobi as original are: I, 5, 1—4 (exposition); I, 5, 5—7, 9 (introduction of city Ayōdhyā and king Daśaratha); I, 6, 2—4 (epithets of Daśaratha); I, 18, 16, 22, 25 (introduction of Daśaratha's sons). From Book II, Jacobi continues the text with II, 1, 6, 8.

⁴ Cf. also the Critical Edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa* by G. H. Bhatt, Vol. I. 1960, Introduction p. XXXI.

⁵ Jacobi, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

ancestors is a constant motive in Sanskrit epics⁶ in the introductory parts. But beyond this, the name Sagara and the origin of the Ocean (*sāgara*) seems to conceal a very subtle poetic allusion in the *kāvya* manner. One of the most common epithets of great emperors in the epics is "whose kingdom has the Ocean as its boundary". Thus, by the occurrence of the words *Sagara* and *sāgara* in the introductory stanzas *subintelligitur*: 'I will praise the Ikṣvāku race whose members have dug the Ocean, the boundary of their empire'.⁷

Such refined allusions are characteristic of the *kāvya* style and, indeed, I, 5, 1 sqq. is the only section of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* kept in this style. This is the style of the earliest, i.e. Vālmīkian, stage of *kāvya* poetry, somewhat different from the later, classical *kāvyas*. The difference is clearly shown by a comparison of R. I, 5 with the opening of the *Raghu-vaṃśa* of Kālidāsa, a poem which intentionally follows Vālmīki. In R. I, 5 there is no invocation of heavenly powers with which K. begins his poem, and instead of the lyrical subjectivism of K. and later *kāvya* poets (i.e. poetic pride or false modesty), the author in R. I, 5, 1—4 speaks with epic objectivity: the allusion to his role does not go beyond a 1st Sing. *vartayiṣyāmi*⁸, 'I will relate'.⁹

The lines I, 5, 3cd and 4cd call for a few special remarks. In the śloka I, 5, 3 *Ikṣvākūṇīm idaṃ tēṣāṃ rājñāṃ vaṃśe mahātmanāṃ | mahad utpannam ākhyānaṃ Rāmāyaṇam iti śrutam* the reference to the title of the work as well-known (*śrutam*) is surprising. However, it is not to be regarded as evidence of the post-Vālmīkian origin of the line. In the case of later addition we should expect, beyond the title of the work, the mention of the renowned author Vālmīki as well, as it is really the case in the spurious cantos I, 1—4. More likely is

⁶ Cf. note 2. on the *vaṃśānucarita*. But it is to be pointed out that in ancient epics the record of ancestors was restricted to short mentions; a full list of the members of the race is always in the great epics to be suspected as spurious, as, e.g., the genealogy of the Ikṣvāku race with special reference to Sagara in R. III, 110; similarly, Viṣvāmitra's genealogy in R. I, 32 sqq.

⁷ The older summary in R. I, 1 serves as proof of the originality of the Ikṣvāku-Sagara intonation: the summarization of the poem in this canto — which has bearings only on the authentic parts — begins in śl. 8 with the name Ikṣvāku: *Ikṣvākuvāṃśaprabhavō Rāmō nāma janaiḥ śrutah*.

⁸ This is the *consensus codicum* against the *vartayiṣyāvaḥ* of the Vulgate due to the later Kuṣa-Lava legend.

⁹ Another difference of style is that though both *kāvya* and the great epics prefer protracted style of narration but the latter allows repetitions of contents and wording (as R. I, 5—7 does it) which is by the former strongly prohibited in favour of protraction made by the aid of variations. On this point, cf. also my introduction to the Hungarian translation of Kālidāsa, Budapest 1961, p. XII. — On the other hand, stylistic protraction is generally alien to the episodes secondarily incorporated in the great epics; this contrasts R. I, 5—7 with the remaining parts of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa*.

The paper of L. Renou, *Sur la structure du kāvya*, JA CCXLVII [1959], p. 1 sqq. is concerned with other aspects of the theme.

the explanation according to which the Rāma legend (be it called *Rāmōpākhyāna* as in Mbh. III. or something else) was a popular story before the time of Vālmiki and he defines his merits as poet only in composing an epic¹⁰ from the widespread theme. Cantos I, 1—4 decidedly argue against the view that the word *Rāmāyaṇa* in I, 5, 3 should be the fixed title of Vālmiki's work: in I, 1—4 the title varies, beside *Rāmāyaṇa*, as *Rāmacarita*, *Rāmakathā*, testifying that as late as in the first centuries A. D. (when these cantos were added) the work had not yet a fixed title. Thus, the word *Rāmāyaṇa* in I, 5, 3 is no more than an exposition of the theme. Denomination of the subject in the opening lines — the epic exposition — was certainly alien from the earliest Indian epic poetry, as it is shown by the episode stories of the Mbh., but it is a custom of later *kāvya* poetry of which just the Vālmikian *Rāmāyaṇa* was the precursor and model.

I, 5, 4 contains a popular commonplace of Indian social philosophy in the stage of Hinduism (i.e. late epic and purāṇic age): *dharmakāmārthasahitam* (sc. *ākhyānam*). The period in which this thought was fixed as a stereotyped sentence can be established as contemporary to the moral episodes of the Mbh. and to the middle period of *sūtra* and *śāstra* literature, i.e. not later than the second century A. D. The *Rāmāyaṇa* has in common with some *sāstras* that they, similarly, put the phrase *dharma-artha-kāma* at the beginning. Thus, the *Kāma-sūtra* of Vātsyāyana (II cent. A. D.?) uses the three words in the same proverbial form while in the earlier¹¹ *Artha-śāstra* of Kauṭilya *kāma* is not mentioned and *dharma* and *artha* are scarcely more than closely related conceptions (not stereotyped locutions).

On the other hand, the fourth word of the later formula, *mōkṣa* 'redemption' does not figure in the *Rāmāyaṇa* stanza. The word acquires great importance only later, in the period of the addition of the latest parts — esp. Books XII—XIII — to the Mbh. The absence of the word in the spurious cantos 1—4 of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa*, too,¹² shows that the latest additions to the *Rāmāyaṇa*

¹⁰ I, 5, 3 *ākhyānam*, with the ancient term, not the modern *kāvya* as the spurious cantos I, 1—4 use it repeatedly: I, 2, 35, 41, 42; I, 3, 39; I, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15; the term *ākhyānam* occurs in I, 1—4 only sporadically as a vague variant of *kāvya* or anticipation of I, 5, 3 in I, 4, 12, 32; I, 1, 99. — Jacobi (*op. cit.* p. 76—77), referring to the *Rāmōpākhyāna* in Mbh. III, supposes that the Rāma story circulated in oral tradition in different variants, independently of the fixed Vālmikian text. The legend in R. I, 1, 1 sqq. according to which Vālmiki learnt the Rāma story from the ṛṣi Nārada can be regarded as a mythification of the fact that he composed his poem on the basis of a formerly existing story.

¹¹ Its relative chronology to the epics can be concluded from I, 3, 6 according to which the work was written in a time when the legends contained in the later episodes of the Mbh. and R. (even R. VII) were already well-known but were yet no integral parts of the two epics in their present, sacrally fixed form for Kauṭilya cites them in variant forms divergent from the epics.

¹² R. I, 3, 8 repeats I, 5, 4cd in a somewhat divergent form but also without *mōkṣa*: *kāmārthaguṇasamyuktam dharmārthaguṇavistaram*. The passage is to be found in

are previous to the priestly elaboration of the Mbh. made already in the spirit of *mōkṣa*.

Stylistically the lines I, 5, 5 sq. need special attention. The normal form of introductory sentence in Sanskrit epic works is — in Mbh, in *kāvya* poetry and in versified tales — the denomination of hero or place of the action in past (eventually, historical present) tense with the copula *āsīt* (*asti*, *bhavati sma*, etc.). This is the rule in poetic works; the copula is not omitted. On the contrary, in prose literature — in *prose* tales — the same type of sentence *without* the copula has got a characteristic introductory formula. Curiously, this latter type figures in R. I, 5, 5: *Kōśalō nāma muditaḥ sphītō janapadō mahān | niviṣṭaḥ Sarayūtīrē prabhūtadanadhānyavān*. The copula follows in the subsequent stanza: *Ayōdhyā nāma nagarī tatr ā s ī l lōkaviśrutā*. As the attraction of the *āsīt* of the second stanza to the former stanza is not in accordance with epic stylistics, either the participial adjective *niviṣṭaḥ* made the copula unnecessary or this is a very early trace of the influence of prose literature. Elimination of the ślōka is impossible for *tatra* in the next line refers to this stanza.¹³

The following lengthy description of Ayōdhyā (I, 5, 7—23 and sarga 6) ought not to be excluded on the ground of its prolixity.¹⁴ Lengthy description is a peculiarity of the original parts of the poem as in contrast to interpolated episodes (in Books I and VII) which are moderate in narration and avoid decorative protractions (among others, repetitions, in which I, 5—6 abound); cf. note 9. Cantos 5—7 are the only longer parts of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* written in this style identical with that of the authentic Books II—VI.¹⁵ Specially the description of cities is the same in the other parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as against to the Mbh. When speaking about a town, the R. gives a detailed account on its richness, well-constructed buildings, industrious and well-to-do citizens as in I, 5—7 while neither the Mbh. nor the spurious parts of the R. offer such

southern MSS. and is excluded by the Crit. Ed. However, with regard to the variant form in which I, 5, 4 repeats the sentence, it can be retained: repetitions made in somewhat altered form are a speciality of early parts in the great epics while in interpolated lines the repetition is made more often word by word; in *kāvya*, repetition disappears by being changed to variation of the theme.

¹³ In the northern MSS (including the Bengali version) canto 5 begins with śl. 5 of the Vulgate, ślōkas 5, 1—4 continue here canto 4. This is obviously a later distribution for the sake of beginning the sarga with the actual story.

¹⁴ As Jacobi, *ibid*.

¹⁵ It is a different question whether this was the style of the oldest form of the R. („*Ur-Rāmāyaṇa*”) or is a product of the last redaction of the *original* parts. At any rate, this is the *par excellence* R. style different from all other Sanskrit poems. Jacobi, perhaps, goes too far when limiting the original extent of the Vālmīkian poem to 8—10 thousand stanzas (*op. cit.* Vorwort, p. III.). Such a text, bereft of every exuberance of the style, had certainly existed but at a stage earlier than Vālmīki.

descriptions.¹⁶ A distinctive feature of the description of Ayōdhyā in R. I, 5—6 against spurious parts of the poem is its secular character: his artisans and merchants are praised rather than the priests as in the spurious passages.

Canto 6 continues the description of Ayōdhyā in the style of the foregoing sarga. However, in contrast to the vivacity of the former, the list of urban amenities given here is somewhat monotonous. Moreover, from śl. 7 the text employs almost exclusively negative terms: there was nobody without cows, without bracelets, without knowledge, nobody was dishonest etc. The praise of the past made only with words expressive of the absence of faults and misery contains, as a rule, an implied comparison of the happy past with the present calamities. This kind of confrontation is a peculiarity of the *purāṇas*; it is less usual in the authentic parts of the great epics. Thus, probably, canto 6 was enlarged by the interpolation of some spurious stanzas. Naturally, it is impossible to conclude which of them are genuine. Some lines of the Vulgata are eliminated by textual criticism.¹⁷ The four class (*varṇa*) system is more rigidly enunciated here (śl. 19) than elsewhere; a list of foreign peoples is enclosed (śl. 22) as in the later episodes.¹⁸ A number of stylistically unwarrantable repetitions disfigures the text in the second half of the canto.¹⁹ In the metre, *vipulā* forms occur in quick succession: śl. 19, 20, 23, 25, 26.

The same can be said about the following sarga 7 containing the names and praise of the eight ministers (*āmātyāḥ*) of Daśaratha. Nearly a third of the ślōkas is eliminated by textual criticism²⁰ and from the remainder, the authenticity of some ślōkas can be called into doubt, too. From the eight ministers, only Sumantra plays an actual role in the poem, and even he not as a minister but as the king's charioteer and intimate friend. In Books II—VI the ministers (*āmātyāḥ*, *mantriṇaḥ*) figure always without individual names, as a body, never singularly.²¹ The names given to them in I, 7, 3 are etymologic allusions to

¹⁶ Cf. R. II, 6, 10 sqq., the feast. — When the narrow geographic horizon of the R. is to be taken as a sign of the theme being prior to the epoch of the struggle for great empires painted in the Mbh. (Jacobi, *op. cit.* p. 103 sqq.: before Buddha), this thesis can be applied only to the theme and not to the elaboration of the R. which shows more advanced social life than the Mbh. The stylistic richness of the description of the town is a reflexion of the more advanced social reality. Cf. also Winternitz, *Geschichte d. indischen Literatur*,² Bd. I. S. 431

¹⁷ 15ab, 17cd, 18cd, 24ab, 25ab; see Crit. Ed.

¹⁸ Cf., e.g., R. I, 54, 18 sqq.; 55, 2 sqq. The original Vālmīkian parts, according to the custom of fairy tales, abstain from referring to *real* foreign peoples.

¹⁹ Śl. 23 *madānvitair*, 26 *nityamattair*; *pūrṇā* three times.

²⁰ 7 from 24 of the Vulgate, see Crit. Ed.

²¹ Similarly, the priests. Lines giving a list of their names as II, 67, 3 are spurious. The only genuine scenes are those where one or other figures independently from the others as Jābāli in II, 108.

their profession as good statesmen.²² Etymologic names are favoured by the later parts of the poem;²³ the names of original heroes of the epic are independent of their function.

Śl. I, 7, 4 tells about two family priests (*ṛtvijau dvau*: Vasiṣṭha and Vāmadēva) while otherwise only Vasiṣṭha is family priest of Daśaratha. Thus, this stanza can be written off as spurious.²⁴

Śl. I, 7, 14 and 15 are somewhat suspicious by their distinction of city and country (*purē vā rāṣṭrē vā* and immediately after it *rāṣṭraṃ puravaram ca tat*). In the Vālmīkian text, according to the fabulous character of the poem, only the city is taken into account, the country as a political conception being relegated to the background. He regards Kōśala as a territory (*janapada*), not as an administrative entity. In genuine parts of the text, the word *rāṣṭra* (occurring seldom) has the meaning of *rājya* (more common), i.e. kingly power, not country, as here.

Thus, canto 7 seems to have undergone remarkable enlargements by interpolations and, possibly, also certain transformations of the original text. Nevertheless the independent existence of this canto is testified by its closing stanza (in *indravajrā* metre) the originality of which raises no suspicions.

The closing stanzas in different lyric metres at the end of each sarga seem to be, in certain circumstances, proof of originality. In the authentic parts, the predominant majority of the cantos is closed by one or more recapitulating stanzas written in metres other than ślōka. In the *Bāla-kāṇḍa*, on the contrary, they appear very seldom. In this book, a certain regularity can be observed in their occurrence. They emerge periodically: at the end of a series of cantos they are to be found with comparatively great regularity; after it, they totally disappear. Moreover, the cantos supplied with closing stanzas are just those dealing with the leading story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, while the independent episodes of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* are never concluded in this way. The cantos after which they occur in Book I are: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, 19, 77.²⁵ It is not difficult to distinguish three groups: I. Additional introductory cantos 1–4; obviously, they imitate the metric peculiarity of Vālmīki's work familiar to them also from the contemporary early *kāvya* poetry. II. Original introductory cantos 5–7. III. The legend of incarnation of Viṣṇu as Rāma, added to the original Vālmīkian poem at a later stage: cantos 15–18/I. — Canto 77 (the last canto of Book I) takes up once more the thread of the leading story and is closely

²² *Dhṛṣṭir Jayantō Vijayaḥ Surāṣṭrō Rāṣṭravardhanaḥ | Akōpō Dharmapālāśca Sumantraś cāṣṭamō 'rthavit*

²³ Cf. *Acta Orient. Hung.* XVII [1964], pp. 189 sq.

²⁴ The following ślōka I, 7, 5 with further names of priests is excluded by Crit. Ed.

²⁵ Six further occurrences in the Vulgate are excluded by Crit. Ed.: after sargas 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 26.

connected with the following (original) book. Puzzling are the closing stanzas after 18—19: Viśvāmitra solicits Rāma's help against the demons and they begin their journey which takes up the greatest part of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* and is evidently spurious. Both stanzas are based one upon the other and, provided that they are not to be eliminated as interpolations, perhaps furnish a date of relative chronology. If genuine, they are, possibly, fruits of *Systemzwang* i.e. accommodation to the immediately foregoing cantos which are closed by lyric stanzas. If this is true, it means that the entire cycle of Viśvāmitra legends has got incorporated with the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* after the incorporation of the Viṣṇu *avatāra* myth, itself secondary. Accepting the hypothesis that the closing stanzas primarily belonged to those sargas of Book I which were parts of the authentic body of the poem, and therefore dealt with the leading story, it seems a reasonable conclusion that the Viṣṇu myth, being an enlargement of the leading story, adopted also the compositional peculiarity of the latter, i.e. the closing stanzas.

The evidence given by the closing stanzas coincides with the arguments gained both from stylistic peculiarities and from the content of the text. Cantos I, 6—5 (where closing stanzas are to be found) are a stylistic unit greatly diverging from the style of the following cantos 8 sqq. At the same time, the content, too, prove the originality of the former and the spuriousness of the latter. In I, 8 begins the description of Daśaratha's *aśvamēdha* sacrifice celebrated by him in order to gain a son. An almost insoluble question is whether some elements of this story belonged to the original poem. In the following books, no reference is made to the king's sacrifice and the birth of Rāma. It is possible that in the general description of Ayōdhyā and Daśaratha's court the sons were introduced briefly without referring to their birth. If this was the case, these lines are irretrievably lost. In the present text, nothing shows traces of such an exposition; it might have been completely supplanted by the *aśvamēdha* story. (Jacobi's selection is, at this point, too arbitrary and rigid.) *Re ipsa*, there is no decisive argument against the originality of the motive "sacrifice for gaining a son". The motive is well attested in short stories incorporated in the *Mahābhārata*; moreover, it came to become a stereotype of epic overture.²⁶ Notwithstanding this, it seems more reasonable that the horse sacrifice in the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* is a clumsy imitation of this stereotyped topics made in the time when the *avatāra* myth — to which it is allied — was added to the poem. The exaltation of horse sacrifice raises suspicion. The power of this sacrifice is, indeed, stated as early as in the *brāhmaṇas* but even this circumstance speaks against the authenticity of the passage for the original text of the great epics does not continue the *brāhmaṇa* literature. *Brāhmaṇa*-like priestly legends penetrate the epics only secondarily and considerably later; in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, in the

²⁶ *Sāvitryōpākhyāna*, birth of Draupadi, etc.

period of the addition of Books I and VII.²⁷ In R. I, 8 (or 12) the motive itself makes likely the brāhmaṇic origin not to speak of the elaboration showing peculiar features of non-authentic passages. In contrast to decorative prolixity of the foregoing cantos, in sarga 8 the narration is held in laconically succinct sentences bereft of ornamental epithets and protracted descriptions. A sign of stylistic inferiority of the passage is that in spite of the sober tone, the unextensive action takes a lengthy form in the narration because of unnecessary repetitions of situations and intertwined gnomic reflexions. Some lines are grammatically incorrect: śl. 3 is an imperfect sentence without predicate: *sa niścītām matim kṛtvā yaśavyam iti buddhimān* |²⁸ *mantribhiḥ saha dharmātmā sarvair api kṛtāmabhiḥ*. Śl. 8—9 look as if enlarged from one sloka to two: *mama lālapyamānasya sūtārtham nāsti vai sukham* | *tadārtham hayamēdhēna yakṣyā-mīti matir mama* || *tad ahaṃ yaśtum icchāmi śāstradr̥ṣṭēṇa karmaṇā* | *katham prāpsyāmy ahaṃ kāmam buddhir atra vicintyatām*. Either śl. 9 or 8cd and 9cd are to be eliminated for the second *tad* is impossible in this form. In śl. 10 containing 3 lines the middle part is superfluous. In 13cd the subject is *rājā* and the same word *rājā* is the subject of the next 14ab against epic usage (either the anaphoric pronoun *sa* or nothing but conjunctions such as *tatra*, *tadā* should be used). The metre from śl. 19 is irregular, *vipulā* forms occur in a proportion of almost 50%. *Brahmarāksasa* in śl. 17 is a category of later epic time²⁹ and of fairy tales.

The summary in R. I, 1 speaks against the authenticity of the *aśvamēdha* sacrifice: it does not mention it though it follows with great accuracy the text of the original parts.³⁰

In the southern MSS (Vulgate) canto I, 8 is repeated as canto 12 after the *R̥ṣyaṣṛṅga* episode (cantos 9—11). The problem of priority is practically of no importance for the three cantos between them are very late borrowings from purāṇic texts.³¹ After the interpolation of the legend some MSS repeated the neighbouring canto.³²

²⁷ On the power of horse sacrifice, see R. VII, 90, 24 (the story of *Ila-Ilā*): *idr̥ṣō hy aśvamēdhasya prabhāvaḥ*. Cf. the same thought in the *Āśvamēdhika-parva* of the Mbh.

²⁸ Is perhaps *buddhimān* a corruption of some verb form?

²⁹ Cf. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology* (1915), p. 44.

³⁰ See note 7. — On the relative age of R. I, 1 see Jacobi, *op. cit.* p. 12.

³¹ Kirfel, *Rāmāyaṇa Bālakāṇḍa und Purāṇa*, Die Welt des Orients 1947, pp. 113 sqq. (cited by Crit. Ed. 1, p. 453.) Cf. also Crit. Ed. Introduction, p. XXXI.

³² Did the corruption take place in the manner that the purāṇic legend got interpolated in the southern MSS originally (correctly) after Daśaratha's declaration (canto 8 ~ 12), in the northern MSS (less correctly) before it, and then, influenced by the northern version, the southern MSS repeated the text once more after the *R̥ṣyaṣṛṅga* episode? — The inferiority of sarga 12 of the Vulgate to 8 turns out from the fact that 12 mentions *R̥ṣyaṣṛṅga* while 8 does not know him. Canto 8 has some better readings (8,8 *lālapyamānasya* is better than 12,8 *tālapyamānasya*, 8, 9 *śāstradr̥ṣṭēṇa karmaṇā* than 12, 9 *hayamēdhēna karmaṇā*).

It is reasonable to conclude that with canto 7 (or, with some elements of canto 8) the fragment of the original Vālmīkian text in the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* comes to a close, and the following parts, up to the last lines of Book I, have nothing to do with the genuine story. There is only one canto more kept, in some measure, in the style of the original text: the first half of sarga 13. The description of citizens gathering for the sacrifice in I, 13 follows in a certain measure the Vālmīkian pattern as can be seen in sarga I, 5. But this seems to be a simple imitation of the style. Although at variance with later episodes — where only the role of priests is exalted at sacrifices — here preparations are made by and for the citizens, the text bears traces of conflation rather than genuine composition. Śl. 6 repeats *vrddhān* within the same stanza, śl. 7, in the same way, *śilpakārān—śilpināḥ*, the immediately following śl. 11—13 *tathā pauraṇas-yāpi*.³⁴ The enumeration of the four *varṇas* in śl. 20 may be suspected. Thus, the first half of sarga 13 is probably the fruit of the same compositional activity which, with the intention of following the style of the original introduction, adjusted canto 8 (12) to the preceding cantos. Such intention can be detected no more from the second half of sarga 13 the text of which is later than the interpolation of the R̥ṣyaśṛṅga legend for at the end of the canto he takes over the role of the family priest Vasiṣṭha.

Up to the last canto of the book, nothing more seems to be original (except, perhaps, some isolated lines). The first part of the last canto 77, too, is decisively spurious. The first śloka deal with the mythic hero Paraśurāma, śl. 11—14 speak of the marriage of all four brothers, though in Books II—VI Lakṣmaṇa and Bharata are unmarried. Curiously, even the obviously spurious parts of the canto (śl. 6 sqq.) show an explicit tendency to follow the Vālmīkian style of narration. The city celebrating the return of the royal family is described in terms borrowed from the *Ayōdhyā-kāṇḍa*. The difference is that in the authentic text the given terms are exploited for the sake of larger decorative descriptions, while in I, 77, 6—8 they are reduced to simple *epitheta ornantia* in the extent of a single short sentence. Similar stylistic peculiarities (imitation) are to be seen in cantos I, 8 and 13. It seems that the parts under question — those which connect the heterogeneous bulk of the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* with the original text — show the traces of a tendency to follow the original decorative style of the poem, while both the independent episodes and the later legends on Rāma are written in a different (laconic, narrative) style.

In the contents of sarga I, 77, there is a break in śl. 15: a new action begins with the words *kasyacit tv atha kālasya*. Such phrases usually are to be found in first lines of cantos. A turning over to a new theme within the canto is a comparatively rare phenomenon in both epics. Thus, the divergencies in textual tradition (the northern MSS beginning here a new sarga, moreover, a new

³⁴ Śl. 11cd—12 are spurious, according to Crit. Ed.

kāṇḍa) have some support in the contents. From this śloka, there is no longer reference to the marriage of Daśaratha's sons. The second half of the canto is obviously of different origin. However, the genuinity of the second half, too, can be doubted. Here Daśaratha sends his son Bharata, accompanied by Śatrughna, to the maternal uncle of the former, while in II, 8, 28 it is queen Kai-kēyī who sends Bharata, and here without Śatrughna.³⁶ From the present text of I, 77 Śatrughna cannot be eliminated by any textual conjecture for each of the three ślokas about Bharata's departure involves his brother as well.³⁷ But when excluding certain slokas in their present form (up to I, 77, 20ab) it is not impossible that the remainder is a fragment of the original Vālmīkian poem. After śl. 20ab there is another break in the context. The stanza 20cd begins: *gatē tu Bharatē Rāmō Lakṣmaṇas ca. . .* The phrase *gatē tu* can well be the beginning of a new canto. Note also that only Bharata figures here without Śatrughna, while in the preceding stanzas the union of the two younger brothers was emphasized (see note 37). As to the style, śl. 20cd—24ab may be original. The ideal family conduct of Rāma as well as the happiness of the citizens under the ideal rule are described briefly but in phrases of Vālmīkian language with moderate repetitions and parallelism of expressions. In śl. 23 the totality of the inhabitants of the city is defined by the terms *brāhmaṇā naiḡamās tathā*, not by the enumeration of the four classes as in the suspected passages.

Śl. 24cd—25ab is spurious, an anticipation of II, 1, 6. The following śl. 25cd etc. with *ca* does not continue this stanza (*Rāmas ca. . .*).

If I, 77, 20cd sqq. *gatē tu Bharatē* etc. are to be regarded as a fragment (perhaps, first line of a sarga) of the original poem, then we must suppose that some preceding parts of unknown length were lost and were superseded by the spurious passages of the present text of canto I, 77. It is impossible to clear up what was said originally about Bharata's absence and about the marriage of Rāma with Sītā. The stanzas I, 77, 25cd—29 about the happy matrimonial life of the couple seem to be original but they do not introduce the wife: the marriage is supposed to be recorded at an earlier term.³⁸

The question of the authenticity of canto I, 77 is closely connected with the problem of the following sarga II, 1. The first ślokas of Book II (1, 1—4) allude to the suspected middle part of I, 77, the visit of *two* brothers to Yudhājit. The transposition of this part (I, 77, 15cd—24ab, in the northern MSS, certa-

³⁶ Śatrughna, indeed, appears in the following śloka II, 8, 29 but this śloka is a spurious gloss (with the usual *hi* of the glosses and with the unpoetic construction *gataḥ—gataḥ*) as it turns out from the fact that II, 8, 30 continues the simile beginning in II, 8, 28cd, not II, 8, 29.

³⁷ I, 77, 17ab—19cd: *cakrāma Śatrughnasahitas; Śatrughnasahitō yayau; Bharatam saśatrughnam.*

³⁸ In the last two stanzas, the comparison of Rāma and Sītā with the divine couple Viṣṇu and Śrī contains no allusion to the late incarnation legend; the simile is nothing but a stereotype of Sanskrit poetry.

inly secondary) to Book II does not solve the problem. The main difficulty is that if śl. II, 1, 1–5 (on Bharata and Śatrughna) are not to be regarded as authentic ones, there is nothing to what the pronoun *tēṣām* in the next śl. 6 could be made to refer (*tēṣām api mahātējā Rāmō ratikarah pituh | Svayaṃbhūr iva bhūtānām babhūva guṇavattarah*). This latter ślōka seems to be original; its originality is proved by its anticipation in I, 77, 24–25: *tēṣām atiyasā lōkē Rāmaḥ satyaparākramaḥ | Svayaṃbhūr* etc. By the twofold occurrence is indicated a seam: similarly as the repetition of canto I, 8 as I, 12 took place on account of the interpolation of an episode at this point, the reappearance of śl. I, 77, 24 in II, 1, 6 is a proof of some alien matter having been incorporated at this place. In this case, the second occurrence of the ślōka is original for here it fits into the context, while I, 77, 24–25 is not connected grammatically either with the foregoing or with the following sentence.

It is remarkable that certain stanzas of this part I, 77 ~ II, 1 occur also in canto I, 18, *passim*. Thus, the last mentioned ślōka reads in I, 18, 24bc–26 (rather fragmentary): *tēṣām kētur iva jyēṣṭhō Rāmō ratikarah pituh | babhūva bhūyō bhūtānām Svayaṃbhūr iva saṃmataḥ || sarvē vēdavidah sūrāḥ sarvē lōkahitē ratāḥ | sarvē jñānōpasampannāḥ sarvē samuditā guṇaiḥ || tēṣām api mahātējā rāmaḥ satyaparākramaḥ | iṣṭaḥ sarvasya lōkasya śasāṅka iva nirmalaḥ ||* (If the last hemistich is excluded, as Crit. Ed., the line remains here unfinished.) — Śl. II, 1, 8 also appears in I, 18, 12: *Kauśalyā śuśubhē tēna* [sc. *Rāmēṇa*] *putrēṇāmitatējasā | yathā varēṇa dēvānām Aditir Vajrapāṇinā*. Now, the sarga I, 18 — the birth legend of Daśaratha's four sons as incarnations of Viṣṇu — is, in its entirety, definitely spurious. This does not exclude, however, the possibility that some lines of an original Vālmīkian passage have been taken over by this canto embedding them into the incarnation myth. This harmonizes with the hypothesis that I, 77 ~ II, 1 have reserved in a comparatively less corrupt form the fragments of the original introduction. The ślōka *Kauśalyā śuśubhē tēna* contains an epic pattern figuring always after the report of the birth of the king's son; it can hardly be used in reference to adult sons as the present form of the text in R. II, 1, 8 does. Since in II, 1 the stanza is immediately continued by Rāma's eulogy and appointment to *yuvarāja*, this permits some obvious conclusions to be made concerning the original structure of the text: it seems that after a quite lengthy decorative description of Ayōdhyā and Daśaratha's kingdom the poet without any details related that Daśaratha had four (or three?) sons among whom Rāma was the most eminent, etc.

The antecedents, however, are not clear. It remains uncertain how the marriage of Rāma was narrated (the final part of the narration is, perhaps, to be looked for in I, 77, 25–29) and what was said about Rāma's brothers before the joining ślōka II, 1, 6 (= I, 18, 26) *tēṣām api* etc. if the passage I, 77, 15–24 is not to be regarded as genuine. At any rate, from II, 1, 6 onwards (except the spurious śl. 7) the original Vālmīkian text continues.